

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

Wright Pride Family, Trust, by and through  
Samuel Wright, Trustee,

Plaintiff,

v.

J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, N.A., and L & K  
Recovery LLC,

Defendants.

C/A: 2:25-cv-5972-RMG

**ORDER**

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) (Dkt. No. 23) of the Magistrate Judge recommending that the Court dismiss the Wright Pride Family Trust’s complaint and deny all other pending motions as moot. For the reasons set forth below, the Court adopts the R&R as the order of the Court, dismisses the complaint, and denies all remaining motions as moot.

The Wright Pride Family Trust, by and through Samuel Wright Trustee, filed a complaint in state court which Defendants removed. Because a pro se individual such as Mr. Wright cannot represent an “artificial entity” like the trust, (Dkt. No. 23 at 1), the Magistrate Judge issued an order directing the Trust to obtain counsel and warning it that noncompliance with the court’s order would result in dismissal. (Dkt. No. 5) (warning that “any pleading filed by a lay person must be disregarded as a nullity if counsel is not retained by the trust” and that if “no counsel is obtained, this action may not proceed farther”) (emphasis removed). The Trust never obtained counsel, and the Magistrate Judge issued an R&R recommending that this action between dismissed and that all other pending motions be denied as moot. (Dkt. No. 23).

The Court adopts the R&R as the order of the Court, dismisses this complaint, and denies all pending motions as moot. The Trust did obtain counsel and the action cannot proceed. As the R&R notes, “[i]t is well established that a litigant may not appear pro se on behalf of any ‘artificial

entity.’ ” *Hargrove , Tr. for Hargrove Empire Irrevocable Tr. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, No. 5:25-CV-433-FL, 2025 WL 2156830, at \*1 (E.D.N.C. July 29, 2025) (quoting *Rowland v. California Men's Colony, Unit II Men's Advisory Council*, 506 U.S. 194, 201 (1993)).

Mr. Wright’s objections to the R&R are unavailing. (Dkt. No. 28). Mr. Wright claims that since the R&R’s filing, he has “resigned as trustee” and that, by extension, he wishes to file an amended complaint to “reflect the correct Plaintiff status.” (*Id.* at 2). Mr. Wright may certainly file a *new* lawsuit to reflect his supposed changed circumstances. But for the reasons stated in the R&R, *this* lawsuit cannot continue. (Dkt. No. 23) (noting that “any pleading filed by the Trust must be disregarded as a nullity since counsel has not been retained”).

For the forgoing reasons, the Court **ADOPTS** the R&R (Dkt. No. 23) as the Order of the Court and **DISMISSES** the instant action without prejudice and without leave to amend. All other pending motions are **DENIED** as moot.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Richard Mark Gergel  
United States District Judge

September 5, 2025  
Charleston, South Carolina